

**REMARKS**

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the January 15, 2010 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the claims. This Amendment E amends claims 8, 11-12, 22, and 26. No new matter has been added.

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 1-6, 8, and 10. Claim 8 is amended to correct antecedent basis. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15 and 22-29 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Applicants request that the Examiner now have the drawings as originally filed reviewed and accepted.**

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103****Claims 11-15 and 26-29**

Claims 11-15 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson et al (US Patent 6,708,217) in view of Egli et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0110234) and further in view of Montagna et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0242322). Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination render these claims unpatentable.

As recommended by the Examiner, independent claims 11 and 26 have been amended to recite fidelity tags and selection of content type attributes based on a size restriction of the display, and are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as allowed independent claim 1.

Claims 12-15 and 27-29 depend from allowable claims 11 and 26 respectively, and are allowable for similar reasons.

**Claims 22-25**

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson in view of Egli, further in view of Montagna and further in view of Smith et al (US Patent 6,463,462). Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination render these claims unpatentable.

As recommended by the Examiner, independent claim 22 has been amended to recite fidelity tags and selection of content type attributes based on a size restriction of the display, and is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as allowed independent claim 1.

Claims 23-25 depend from allowable claim 22, and is allowable for similar reasons.

**Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 11-15 and 22-29, in addition to allowed claims 1-6, 8 and 10, as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, as agreed by the Examiner, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the claims. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

**Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to still not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736  
SENNIGER POWERS LLP  
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 345-7000

RMB/DXS/dss